

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. (JP 63030623). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the additional damping channel is arcuately formed in the dividing wall. This subject matter is supported at, for example, Figures 1a and 1b where the additional damping channel 70 is shown to be arcuately formed. No new matter is added.

Okamoto does not anticipate such a structure. In contrast, Okamoto merely discloses a damping channel 18b that is merely a through hole in the alleged dividing wall 11. Because Okamoto does not disclose this feature, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Okamoto.

Similar to claim 1, claim 12 is amended to recite that the second damping channel is arcuately formed in the dividing wall. Again, this subject matter is illustrated at, for example, Figures 1a and 1b. No new matter is added.

As stated above, Okamoto does not anticipate such a structure because Okamoto merely teaches a damping channel 18b that is merely a through hole in the alleged dividing wall 11. Because Okamoto fails to disclose this feature, claim 12 and each corresponding dependent claim are not anticipated.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, therefore, are respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4-11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al (JP 63030623) in view of Ozawa (U.S. Pat. No. 4,853,723). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-11 and 13-15 depend from independent claims 1 and 12, respectively, addressed above. These claims are neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 31, 2007

By: 

Philip E. Rettig, Reg. No. 34,000  
Jason A. Heist, Reg. No. 51,797

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

PER/JAH/jmg